SUBJECT No. 32.

Abolition of the levy of contribution from raiyats in respect of works that ought to be executed at Government cost.

Mr. S. A. Javaraiya, Seringapatam Taluk.

Mr. S. A. Javaraiya.—75 per cent of the subjects of the State are villagers and by far the greater portion of the income of the State comes from these who are subjected to many kinds of taxes. In the year 1873-74, however, all existing levies were removed and only Local Cess was levied instead. We are thankful for that step and for the various facilities given to us by Government. But it would be more equitable if the income which comes from villagers is spent on villages also instead of allowing only the towns to enjoy it. The contribution levied for the maintenance of schools in villages is an example.

First Member of Council.—This is a voluntary contribution and there is absolutely no compulsion on villagers that they should pay the contribution and there is also no order about it.

Mr. Krishna Sastry.—There is an indirect compulsion. According to the new rules relating to Local Self-Government, a cess may be levied if in any area two-thirds of the population thereof are agreeable to such a levy or commute it to labour for 18 or 20 days. But in the case of towns, there is not this latter compulsion; also more and more facilities are being afforded to them while in the cases of villages, the people have to pay contributions for any work of improvement, for schools for libraries, roads, village halls, etc. The income of raiyats is limited but the demands on their purse is ever on the increase. For some time to come, this burden on the raiyats should be lessened and Government should bear the cost.

Further, even though Government promise one-half of the cost of any work, it lapses because the raiyats fail to pay the other half. Instead of allowing it to be so, it may be ordered that, whether raiyats pay their share of the cost or not, the Government grant may be fully spent.

Revenue Commissioner.—No contributions are being recovered from raiyats for sanitary works, water supply, drainage, etc. In regard to other works however, Local Boards should provide necessary funds and to help them in doing this, Government have sanctioned *mohatarfa* and other grants. Apart from all this, to afford encouragement, urgent works are taken up by Government themselves on promise of payment of one-half of the cost by the raiyats of the areas concerned. They hope that this concession of payment of one-half the cost will be sufficient

encouragement for the people to realize their responsibilities. This, therefore, cannot be claimed as a matter of right. The idea is, that people must undertake these works themselves.

Mr. Shamiengar and another member.—The contribution from ryots for village improvement should be done away with as in many instances the grants from Government lapse owing to the failure of the villagers to pay their share of the contribution. The total grant for village improvement might with advantage be divided among all the villages without any contribution being expected from them.

Mr. Vema Reddy—Per contra.—If the request is granted, the enthusiasm on the part of the people will subside. So the present rule requiring contribution for improvement work from villagers is all right. Rather than do away with the contribution altogether as suggested by some of the members, it would be better to reduce the contribution from one-half to one-third and pay the balance of two-thirds from Government.

Dewan.—Cannot be done.

SUBJECT No. 33.

Supervision over tanks.

Messrs. Ramakrishna Iyer, Kolar Taluk; T. Srinivasachar, Kolar Municipality and Venkatarayappa, Chikballapur Municipality.

As the present Marahmat Department has not been as brisk as it ought to be in restoring minor tanks it may be amalgamated with the Public Works Department proper.

Dewan.—The question is under consideration.

SUBJECT No. 34.

Levy of assessment on improvements by the holder of the land.

Messrs. Chikka Rama Reddi, Bagepalli Taluk and Venkatarayappa; Chikballapur Municipality.

Mr. Chika Rama Reddy.—Even when wells are sunk by ryots themselves in dry lands and *bagayet* crops are raised by them, it is hard to levy wet or garden rate. Dry rate of *kandayam* may be levied in such cases.

Mr. C. Sreenivasa Rao.—We remember the promise once made by Government that no cess would be levied on lands fed by wells sunk by private capital.

Another Member.—In the case of tanks, Government have to incur some expenditure on account of supervision etc., but in the case of wells sunk in *Khushki* lands, no such expenditure is incurred by Government who should therefore collect nothing from the raiyats.

Superintendent of Revenue Survey.—Wells may be sunk by the raiyats but water is not created by them. The wells are fed by tanks and only such of the *khushki* lands as raise *bagayat* crops with the indirect help of water from tanks are charged higher